

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/724,191	JACOBS, KENNETH	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Hugh B. Thompson II	3634	

All Participants:

(1) Hugh B. Thompson II.

(2) Mr. Peter Costas.

Status of Application: non-final

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 17 January 2006
Time: am
Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

n/a

Claims discussed:

1, 4, 9, 11, 13

Prior art documents discussed:

Armstrong-044

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The above-mentioned claims will be amended to correct minor antecedent basis ambiguities. Claim 1 will be further amended to recite that the top roller mechanism is "frictionally fitted to" the top rail, this connection as provided for in the Specification on page 9, paragraph 36, lines 1-4. These changes serve to distinguish over the Armstrong reference or any combination with other references.